Patricia L. Cummins 14715 S. Camino Tierra Del Rio Sahuarita, Arizona 85629 520.730.5650

THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA JUNE 19, 2017

CHIEF JUSTICE BALES

In the Matter of:

RULE 123:

EQUAL REMOTE ELECTRONIC ACCESS AND FILING PRIVILEGES FOR PARTIES OF AN ACTION INCLUDING PRO PER LITIGANTS, ATTORNEYS, AND CLIENTS MOTION FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER PER RULE 28 (G) RE: SUPREME COURT RULE 123 PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE JUDICIAL RECORDS OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

This motion for expedited consideration from the Supreme Court comes this day, June 19, 2017 due to the emergent matter and compelling circumstances urgently needing reform as the current situation affects litigant's due process, fair hearings, and Equal Access under the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution continue being denied. Please see the attached Petition.

Pursuant to Rule 28 (G) RULES OF THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT Rule 28, Procedure for Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Rules, Petitioner requests an emergency expedited amendment of Supreme Court Rule 123 which has been found to present an urgent matter of unequal provision of remote electronic access to records and filing privileges given to only attorneys in active cases while

denying pro per litigants of the same. This situation presents compelling circumstances rendering the annual rule processing cycle inadequate. Equal remote access to records must be provided to both parties now.

WHEREFORE Petitioner showing compelling evidence, circumstances and good cause, respectfully prays and requests the Arizona Supreme Court consider this rule change on an expedited basis consistent with the goal of the Arizona Supreme Court to facilitate equal access to justice, the urging from the United States Department of Justice "We urge you to review court rules and procedures within your jurisdiction to ensure that they comply with due process, equal protection, and sound public policy", and with regard to the amended Arizona Revised Statute 12-284.02 (A) signed by the Governor of Arizona in March 2017, and render an Administrative Order with an immediate effective date which includes:

- 1. If THE PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT PROVIDES ACCESS OR FILING PRIVILEGES TO ATTORNEYS, THE PRIVILEGES MUST ALSO BE PROVIDED TO PRO SE LITIGANTS.
- 2. Change "may" to "MUST" in the Supreme Court Rule 123, (17)(g)(1) and (17)(g)(A)

Respectfully submitted this 19th day of June, 2017.

/s/ Patricia Cummins